

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ELDRIDGE SALLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

**AMERCO, doing business as “U-HAUL”;
U-HAUL INTERNATIONAL, INC.;
U-HAUL CO.; and, FALLS
MANUFACTURING CO.,**

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION

NO. 13-921

ORDER

AND NOW, this 15th day of July, 2013, upon consideration of the Motion of Defendant, AMERCO, to Dismiss the Complaint (Document No. 4, filed February 25, 2013), and the related submissions of the parties,¹ the Motion to Dismiss Complaint, or Alternatively a Motion for More Definite Statement, of Defendants, U-Haul Co. of Pennsylvania and Falls Manufacturing Co. (A Division of U-Haul Co. of Pennsylvania) (Document No. 7, filed February 25, 2013), and the related submissions of the parties,² Plaintiff, Eldridge Salley’s Motion to Remand Filed Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1447 (Document No. 10, filed March 8, 2013), and Defendant, U-Haul International, Inc.’s Response in Opposition to Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand (Document No. 12, filed March 25, 2013), for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum dated July 15, 2013, **IT IS**

ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:

1. That part of Plaintiff, Eldridge Salley’s Motion to Remand Filed Pursuant to 28

¹ The related submissions are: Plaintiff, Eldridge Salley’s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendant, Amerco’s 12(b)(2) Motion to Dismiss (Document No. 8, filed March 6, 2013), and the Reply Brief of Defendant, AMERCO, to the Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss the Complaint for Lack of Personal Jurisdiction (Document No. 14, filed March 25, 2013).

² The related submissions are: Plaintiff, Eldridge Salley’s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ 12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss (Document No. 9, filed March 8, 2013), and the Reply of Defendants, U-Haul Co. of Pennsylvania and Falls Manufacturing Co. (A Division of U-Haul Co. of Pennsylvania) to Plaintiff’s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss the Complaint, or Alternatively a motion for More Definite Statement (Document No. 13, filed March 25, 2013).

U.S.C.A. § 1447 seeking a remand of this case to the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County is **GRANTED** and this case is **REMANDED** to the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County;

2. That part of Plaintiff, Eldridge Salley's Motion to Remand Filed Pursuant to 28 U.S.C.A. § 1447 seeking fees and expenses is **DENIED**; and,

3. Because the case is remanded to the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County, the Court does not rule on defendants' motions to dismiss.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall **MARK** this case **CLOSED**.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Hon. Jan E. DuBois

DuBOIS, JAN E., J.